

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR
THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF ALABAMA
EASTERN DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA)	
)	
v.)	CASE NO. 3:06-cr-208-MEF
)	(WO)
JASON EDWARD COFIELD)	

ORDER

On September 29, 2006, the defendant filed a Motion to Suppress (Doc. #22). The Magistrate Judge held a hearing on October 27, 2006 and a Recommendation was entered on February 23, 2007. The government filed an objection (Doc. #45) to the Recommendation on March 5, 2007. A final resolution of the motion to suppress has not been rendered. While the granting of a continuance is left to the sound discretion of the trial judge, *United States v. Warren*, 772 F.2d 827, 837 (11th Cir. 1985), the Court is, of course, limited by the requirements of the Speedy Trial Act, 18 U.S.C. § 3161. The Speedy Trial Act provides generally that the trial of a defendant in a criminal case shall commence within 70 days of the latter of the filing date of the indictment or the date the defendant appeared before a judicial officer in such matter. 18 U.S.C. §3161(c)(1); *see United States v. Vasser*, 916 F.2d 624 (11th Cir. 1990).

The Act excludes from this 70 day period any continuance that the judge grants "on the basis of his findings that the ends of justice served by taking such action outweigh the best interest of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial." 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(8)(A).

The Court concludes that a continuance of this case is warranted and that the ends of justice served by continuing this case outweighs the best interest of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. *See United States v. Davenport*, 935 F.2d 1223, 1235 (11th Cir. 1991)(reasonable time necessary for effective preparation is a significant factor for granting a continuance under the Speedy Trial Act).

Accordingly, it is hereby ORDERED that the trial of this case is continued from the March 26, 2007 trial term to the April 23, 2007 trial term.

DONE this the 13th day of March, 2007.

/s/ Mark E. Fuller
CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE